

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/695,402	10/28/2003	Thomas Hathaway	3562-000038	5636	
	27572	7590 01/26/2005		EXAMINER		
	HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 828			LIN, ING HOUR		
		D HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•		1725	· <u></u> ;	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/695,402	HATHAWAY, THOMAS	
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Ing-Hour Lin	1725	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cov r sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a eply within the statutory minimum of thi d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ■ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 2a) ■ This action is FINAL. 2b) ■ The 3) ■ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal mat	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and compared application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) according an applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to by the latest and the correct that are considered to by the latest according to th	ection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A iority documents have beer eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/695,402

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-14 and 17-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al in view of Madono.

Hoffman et al (col. 5, lines 64+) teach the claimed parts washer apparatus for non-caustic cleaning or removing residual casting material from the casting metal part (conductive bodies) 10, comprising a holder (grid) 19; cleaner dispersing system including at least one spray head (nozzle) 40, a fluid recirculator with a supply line 38 and drain pump 48 in line 46 for return to reservoir 34, said holder 19 comprises a first electrode of cathode 26 and the second electrode is connected to a fluid tank 14 containing electrolyte 16 for cleaning or removing the residual casting material from the casting metal part (conductive bodies) 10 held by the holder and inserted in the electrolyte. Hoffman et al fail to teach the use of disintegration additive.

However, Madono (col. 2 lines 22+) teaches the use of disintegration additive including alkali metal carbonates and bicarbonates for the purpose of accelerating the removing the resin bonded sand core of the residual casting material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Hoffman et al the disintegration additive as taught by Madono in order to accelerate the removing the resin bonded sand core of the residual casting material.

Art Unit: 1725

3. Claims 15-16 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al in view of Madono and further in view of Johnson et al.

Hoffman et al in view of Madono fail to teach the use of particular foundry sand and resin.

However, Johnson et al (col. 3, lines 60+) teach the use of particular foundry sand including silica sands and bank sands and synthetic sands and phenolic urethane resin and clay for the purpose of forming sand core or mold for casting metal article such as engine block. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Hoffman et in view of Madono use of particular foundry sand and resin as taught by Johnson et al in order to form sand core or mold for casting metal article such as engine block.

4. Claims 32-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al in view of Madono and further in view of Hoffman et al.

Johnson et al (col. 3, lines 60+) teach the claimed system for the production of a clean industrial part using a casting material of particular foundry sand including silica sands and bank sands and synthetic sands and phenolic urethane resin and clay for the purpose of forming sand core or mold for casting metal article such as engine block. Johnson et al (col. 4, lines 57+) further teach the use of immersing the resin bonded sand core in water or a dilute alkaline solution of sodium hydroxide, potassium hydroxide or sodium carbonate for the purpose of easy removal of the sand core from castings. Johnson et al fail to teach the use of a disintegration additive and a parts washer.

Application/Control Number: 10/695,402

Art Unit: 1725

However, Madono (col. 2 lines 22+) teaches the use of disintegration additive including alkali metal carbonates and bicarbonates for the purpose of accelerating the removing the resin bonded sand core of the residual casting material. Hoffman et al (col. 5, lines 64+) teach the claimed parts washer apparatus for the purpose of non-caustic cleaning or removing residual casting material from the casting metal part (conductive bodies) 10, comprising a holder (grid)19; cleaner dispersing system including at least one spray head (nozzle) 40, a fluid recirculator with a supply line 38 and drain pump 48 in line 46 for return to reservoir 34, said holder 19 comprises a first electrode of cathode 26 and the second electrode is connected to a fluid tank 14 containing electrolyte 16 for cleaning or removing the residual casting material from the casting metal part (conductive bodies) 10 held by the holder and inserted in the electrolyte. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Johnson et al the use of a disintegration additive and a parts washer as taught by Madono and further in view of Hoffman et al in order accelerate the removal of residual casting material from the cast metal part.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 11/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

Art Unit: 1725

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

In this case, applicant argued Madono's plastic capsule used for microencapsulating the disintegration additive is water resistant. However, Madono (col. 2, lines 47-51) teaches the plastic capsule is not an issue because the capsule thermally decomposes during casting process such as pouring molten metal into the mold containing the sand core; and then the additive reacts with the binder in the casting material and accelerates the breakdown of binder bonded core.

Further, the additive is water soluble and can dissolve in the electrolyte 16 contained in the fluid tank 14 for cleaning or removing the residual casting material from the casting metal part.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/695,402

Art Unit: 1725

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ing-Hour Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1180. The

Page 6

examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

I.-H. Lin

KILEY S. STONER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

1-13-05

Thy thom 1/24/05